

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 13, 2004. Claims 1 to 15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 9 and 11 to 15 have been amended, and Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13 and 14 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In response to the objection to the Abstract, the Abstract has been cancelled and a replacement Abstract has been provided. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were objected to for alleged informalities. In response, each of Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 5, 7 to 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,378,887 (Kobayashi); Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,631,848 (Gaultier); and Claims 4, 6, 10, 12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kobayashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,724,103 (Parrault). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a non-contact communication card. The non-contact communication card comprises a communication component which communicates information in a non-contact state, and a time designation component which designates a communication permission time, the communication permission time being set by a user of the card. The non-contact communication card also comprises a communication control component which determines, upon receiving a communication request, whether or not the communication

permission time designated by the time designation component has been reached, permits communication by the communication component when determining that the permission time has been reached, and prohibits communication by the communication component when determining that the permission time has not been reached.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 7 and 13 as amended are respectively directed to a method and a computer program.

Therefore, a feature of the invention of Claims 1, 7 and 13 is that a communication permission time, which is used for permitting/prohibiting communication, is set by a user of the card. By virtue of this feature, in which the communication permission time is set by a user, the unintended communication of information is reduced, and the likelihood of information stealing is decreased.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the Kobayashi, Gaultier and Parrault patents are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that a communication permission time, which is used for permitting/prohibiting communication, is set by a user.

As understood by Applicant, Kobayashi discloses a non-contact type IC card in which a re-access inhibition time setting circuit sets a re-access inhibition period of time for inhibiting re-access for a fixed period of time after an operation of a main circuit is finished. This is said to prevent a double write operation of history in the card due to re-access in a short period of time. See Kobayashi, Abstract; and column 2, line 64 to column 3, line 11.

Although Kobayashi may be seen to disclose that a period of time is set for inhibiting re-access of data, nothing in Kobayashi is seen to teach that such a period of time

is set by a user. Accordingly, Kobayashi is not seen to disclose or suggest that a communication permission time, which is used for permitting/prohibiting communication, is set by a user. In addition, Kobayashi is not seen to disclose or suggest the attendant benefits that such setting of the communication permission time by the user provides, such as reducing the likelihood of information stealing.

As understood by Applicant, Gaultier discloses a method of controlling an electronic circuit. A command is received from a control unit, and is interpreted in either a first manner, if the command is followed by a predetermined dead time, or in a second manner, if a new command is transmitted before expiration of the predetermined dead time. See Gaultier, Abstract; and column 5, lines 26 to 31.

However, nothing in Gaultier is seen to disclose or suggest that its predetermined dead time is set by a user. Moreover, Gaultier is not seen to teach that communication is permitted/prohibited based on whether the predetermined dead time has been reached. Rather, Gaultier merely teaches that a command is interpreted in a first or second manner based on whether a new command is transmitted before expiration of the predetermined dead time. Accordingly, nothing Gaultier is not seen to disclose or suggest that a communication permission time, which is used for permitting/prohibiting communication, is set by a user, nor is Gaultier seen to disclose the attendant benefits provided by such setting of the communication permission time by the user.

Parrault is merely seen to disclose a portable contactless object featuring a main chip and a main antenna enabling communication between the chip and a reader associated with the portable contactless object. See Parrault, Abstract. However, nothing in Parrault is seen to disclose or suggest that a communication permission time, which is

used for permitting/prohibiting communication, is set by a user. Accordingly, Parrault is not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Kobayashi and Gaultier.

Allowance of Claims 1, 7 and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 5 as amended is directed to a non-contact communication card. The non-contact communication card comprises a communication component which communicates information in a non-contact state, and a designation component which designates permission/prohibition of communication, the permission/prohibition of communication being set by a user of the card. The non-contact communication card also comprises a communication control component which prohibits communication by the communication component when prohibition of communication is designated by the designation component.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 11 and 14 as amended are directed to a method and a computer program.

A feature of the invention of Claims 5, 11 and 14 therefore lies in the permission/prohibition of communication being set by a user of the card. The applied references of Kobayashi, Gaultier and Parrault are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As noted above, Kobayashi discloses a non-contact type IC card in which a re-access inhibition period of time is set for inhibiting re-access for a fixed period of time after an operation of a main circuit is finished. However, Kobayashi is not seen to disclose or suggest that permission/prohibition of communication is set by a user.

Gaultier teaches a method of controlling an electronic circuit in which a command is interpreted in a first or second manner based on whether a new command is

transmitted before expiration of the predetermined dead time. However, Gaultier is not seen to disclose or suggest that permission/prohibition of communication is set by a user.

Parrault is merely seen to teach a portable contactless object including a main chip and a main antenna enabling communication between the chip and a reader. However, Parrault is not seen to disclose or suggest that permission/prohibition of communication is set by a user, and is therefore not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Kobayashi and Gaultier.

Allowance of independent Claims 5, 11 and 14 as amended is therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 90690v1